

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 are now in this application. Claims 1-15 are rejected. New claim 16 is added.

Applicants herein traverse and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims and objection cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ritchey (US 5,495,576). Applicants herein respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 1 recites in pertinent part the following:

head detecting means for detecting at least a position of the head of a game player located in a play area before the screen of the monitor in at least one linear direction in a 3D space relative to the screen of the monitor; and

viewing point changing means for moving the viewing point of the simulated camera to follow a displacing direction and a displacing amount of the detected position of the head

Independent claim 15 contains an analogous recitation written in method terminology.

In accordance with each of these independent claims, a position of the head of a game player located in a play area before the screen of the monitor is detected in at least one linear direction in a 3D space relative to the screen of the monitor, and the viewing point of the simulated camera is moved to follow a displacing direction and a displacing amount of the detected position of the head.

It is respectfully submitted that no such teaching is disclosed in Ritchey. While broadly stating that a viewpoint is changed according to a detected head position, the disclosure at column 9, lines 46-58 of Ritchey, which is referred to by the Examiner in support of the rejection, does not in fact teach the invention in the manner claimed, which specifically requires (claims 1 and 15) that the viewpoint moves in such manner that it follows a displacing direction and a displacing amount of the detected head position in at least one linear direction. In this regard, Ritchey fails to indicate whether the detection of "head position" in accordance with the disclosure thereof includes measurement of head position in a linear direction relative to the monitor, and additionally fails to provide teaching or suggestion as to precisely how the viewpoint is to be changed, i.e., specifically that it follows the displacing direction and amount in at least one linear direction, as claimed.

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 15 particularly describe and distinctly claim elements not disclosed in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 2, 6 and 15 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected as obvious over Ritchey, and further in view of Ahdoot (US 5,913,727) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that the proffered combination of references cannot render the rejected claims obvious because the secondary Ahdoot reference does not provide the teaching noted above with respect to the anticipation rejection of claim 1, from which the claims depend, that is absent from the primary Ritchey reference. Thus, the combination of prior art references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, as properly required for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 3 and 4 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 7-14 are rejected as obvious over Ritchey in view of Ahdoot (US 5,913,727), and further in view of Oh (US 5,616,078) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Oh fails to provide what is missing from both Ritchey and Ahdoot, as discussed above, and therefore, the proffered combination of references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, as properly required for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore,

reconsideration of the rejections of claims 5 and 7-14 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 16 is added and is submitted as patentable over the cited art of record, insofar as it recites subject matter directed to a game machine in which a position of a head in at least one direction on the horizontal plane is determined based on position information of the game player's feet detected by a sheet-shaped pressure sensor and in which the viewing point of the simulated camera is moved to follow a displacing direction and a displacing amount of the detected position of the head which, among other features recited therein, is not believed disclosed in the cited art in the manner as claimed. Favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,  
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By Frank J. Jordan by:  
Frank J. Jordan  
Reg. No. 20,456  
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340

*Jordan & HAMBURG*  
Reg. No. 36,049